

## National Republican.

A. M. CLAPP, EDITOR.  
 THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN  
 (Published daily (Sundays excepted) by  
 The National Republican Printing and Publishing Co.,  
 No. 1308 E Street Northwest.  
 TERMS:  
 One copy one year \$10.00  
 One copy one year \$5.00  
 Address NATIONAL REPUBLICAN,  
 Washington, D. C.  
 Ag. Communications for publication should be brief,  
 plainly written, and only upon one side of the paper.  
 When anonymous they will be published only if  
 accompanied by a card of introduction from a  
 reliable source. No correspondence will be published  
 unless accompanied by a card of introduction from a  
 reliable source.  
 Mr. D. DAVIDSON is the Agent for the receipt  
 of Advertisements and Subscriptions for this  
 Paper, and also for the Collection of Accounts.  
 Mr. W. B. POPE is also authorized to receive  
 Advertisements.

Largest Legitimate Morning Circulation in the District.  
 WASHINGTON, JULY 19, 1879.  
 It is a notable fact that no United States marshals have resigned since Congress adjourned, notwithstanding the failure of the fee-bill appropriation.

When a newspaper is going down it is always talking of its over-inflated circulation; but falsehood is a poor substitute for facts.—*Profile Express.*

The post will please paste this in its hat, where it will be convenient for frequent reference when its windy periods come on.

OLD MAN TILDEN "going in heart and soul for EWING" is another singular political apparition. Brother FOSTER may well quake with fear when TILDEN and JOHN G. THOMPSON are so hysterically, demonstratively, and disinterestedly at work against him.

SOME of the anti-Grant politicians are rejoicing over the (to them) newly-discovered fact that WILLIAM E. CHANDLER is opposed to a third term. The truth is, CHANDLER has been a BLAINE man, persistently and consistently, ever since 1876. There is no doubt, however, that he could swallow GRANT without stretching or digesting his palate to any alarming extent.

A SOLDIERMAN delegation from the South seems to be an object which, in their blind opposition to General GRANT, the Democratic press is eagerly seeking. They forget meanwhile that Secretary SHERMAN was a strong candidate and one they could not defeat if he should be nominated. But their efforts to help him rebound boomerang fashion to their own disadvantage. The greater the anxiety they show to defeat the nomination of General GRANT, the greater the certainty that he will be nominated.

It is well not to forget that the Democratic opposition to the faithful execution of the supervisors' law is based upon the assumption that those officers make it an invariable rule to violate their oaths of office on election days and to prostitute their official powers to base partisan purposes. In other words, the Bourbons make the sweeping charge against them that they are all perjured rascals. This not very complimentary assertion regarding the characters of a large and respectable class of citizens forms the basis of one of the most prominent Democratic "issues" of the day.

NORTH CAROLINA is boasting just now over the fact that ex-Governor ALLEN, of Ohio, was born within her limits—a fact which may account, we add, for some of the deceased's REP VAN WINKLE characteristics. But it should not be forgotten that he rose up and left both North Carolina and Virginia before he became the notable statesman afterward known as RISE UP WILLIAM ALLEN. Even at the early date, when in his fifteenth year, he emigrated from Lynchburg, in the latter State, to cast his fortunes with the Buckeyes, Ohio was a thriving and prosperous Commonwealth, and, being free from the dead weight of slavery, offered to him improved opportunities for the development of his abilities as a leader. It was a strange inconsistency in his career, however, that he fled from the accursed institution in two slave States to die during the remainder of his eventful life in a free State.

EVEN Senator THURMAN descends to the most contemptible perversion in attempting to explain the "great victory" won by the Bourbons in the late extra session of Congress. He insinuates indirectly that they succeeded in maintaining "the principle that the Federal Government shall not interfere in the election of officers of the States." The fact is that no one ever attempted to assert the right of the Federal Government to such an interference. All that has ever been claimed in its behalf by Republicans in Congress or elsewhere is the right to supervise the election of its own officials. This is not and cannot possibly be construed as an interference with State elections, unless it is admitted that members of Congress and Presidential electors are officers of the States. If Mr. THURMAN believes they are, let him say so in so many words; but if he does, it will be at the risk of his reputation as a man of ordinary common sense.

It appears from recent developments that WADSWORTH's election to the United States Senate from South Carolina was due to his having been kicked by a mule more than by any other one single fact. When that inglorious incident in his career culminated in the amputation of his leg, the women of the State at large began to pray for him in response to the importunities of some of his more religious admirers, and thereby an impulsive sympathy was created in his behalf which served to silence all opposition to him. If this situation had not prevailed it is quite probable that General MAT GARY, of red-shirt Democracy fame, or some other rival, would have appeared to contest his election on the ground that he is an impostor and not a steadfast representative of the principles of Palmetto Bourbonism. This charge is in part sustained by the awful assertion that WADSWORTH once "dined with a lot of niggers." And the assertion is undoubtedly true, for it is known that in his campaign for Governor, in 1876, he did visit the Clifflin Institute, a negro college, and not only participated in the commencement exercises but partook of a dinner with the faculty. At

this dinner, too, there were present besides the faculty several other colored men, and, wonderful to relate, Bishop GEORGE HAYES, of Georgia, as well. The mule not only kicked his leg off, but knocked the vigor out of his opponents, so that this incident for the time being was overlooked.

THE KANSAS CITY *Journal* has discovered the art of inflicting refined cruelty. For instance, it says:

If General GRANT should remain away until next summer, we don't know what the Democratic press will do meantime. Somehow or other GRANT has become a second nature to these people. They hate him because the people honor him, and they hate him because he pays no attention to their hatred. They will not forgive him for whipping the rebellion as long as one of the old copperhead brood of traitors is above the ground. If they would only promise to leave the country should he be elected, he will be nominated by acclamation and voted in by the largest majority ever given a man since WASHINGTON.

THE Democratic newspapers are all declaring that it never was the intention of Congress to refuse to the Judiciary the necessary money supplies to carry on its legitimate work. But Congress did it, all these declarations to the contrary notwithstanding; and when it is proposed that the United States marshals, who are the ministerial agents of the Judiciary, shall go ahead and execute all of the laws which remain unexecuted relating to their duties, these same scribbles join in the further declaration that Congress will refuse to make a requisite deficiency appropriation for their remuneration. Sensible people will not fail to see in this inconsistency of assertion regarding the Democratic plans the vilest partisan purpose.

THE policy of making water an expensive luxury instead of a convenient commodity or a cheap necessity might have been established in this District years ago when the water works were first built, without much opposition; but it will not do now.

THE people have become accustomed to this free and unrestrained use for sanitary and household purposes, and they will not submit now to an increase in the taxes therefor without protest. After all that has been said on this subject, however, no one has yet attempted to show why our water department should be made a source of profit to the District government. Every one who talks or thinks about it regrets that it is not as free as air; and if the District Commissioners were desirous of complying with the public demand in this matter their efforts would be directed to the reduction of water rates instead of an increase. Let the city and District at large be taxed for the support of our water system, and reduce the rates for service in dwellings, at least, to the lowest possible figure, so that the enjoyment and convenience of its use for bathing, cleansing, and other household purposes shall be within the reach of the poorest among us.

THE STANTON *Valley Virginian* takes us to task slightly, and a correspondent somewhat severely, under the unpleasant heading of "Misrepresentation," because THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN a few days since published a correspondence over the signature of "F.," which criticized with some justice the displaying of the Confederate flag on the 4th instant at Harrisonburg, Va.

We will give the *Valley Virginian* the full benefit of its scold as a matter of simple justice, and for the further reason that it virtually admits the more important cause of complaint that prompted our correspondent to refer to the occurrence at all. It says:

We were in Harrisonburg on the occasion referred to, and heard of such a flag, and also heard but one sentiment in reference to it, and that was of severe condemnation. We did not ask and did not learn who raised it, and seemed to be a source of so much annoyance to a large number of the people who spoke of it and was regarded as so utterly inappropriate that it did not deserve serious notice. United States flags floated from every public place and almost every private residence, and there was nothing that transpired to indicate anything else than the patriotic sentiment of Fourth of July patriotism.

Reference to the portraits of "WASHINGTON, LINCOLN, and JACKSON," which were suspended before the audience, no one ever believed that the Union flag was the high moral character of those Christian men and soldiers. Whatever now may be thought of the policy of secession and no national flag, it is not the Union flag that is the subject of the present controversy. Their moral heroism was amply illustrated in their lives, and while they may have erred in judgment, as we now think they did, the Union flag is not the subject of the present controversy. Their moral heroism was amply illustrated in their lives, and while they may have erred in judgment, as we now think they did, the Union flag is not the subject of the present controversy.

Not satisfied with the connection of the assumed statement of "F.," the *Valley Virginian* assails his motives as follows:

We do not know, nor do we care to know, who penned the article signed "F." If he is a native of the State and a resident of the Valley, he gives evidence of being very ignorant, and an amount of prejudice to be accounted for by no rational methods. His distorted reason is incapable of dealing fairly with any political question, and renders him utterly unfit to take part in the discussion of the Union flag.

To misrepresent the incidents of the occasion of which he treats, and to assign the existence of a spirit which was entirely foreign to that which prevailed, is a serious reflection upon the motives which controlled in the authorship of the article, and reveals a prejudice incapable of doing the fair thing, let it be associated with what will.

We leave "F." to vindicate his motives in his own time and way, as we are only responsible for his statements, having given currency to them. It may not be amiss, however, in this connection, to say that the cause of the criticism of our correspondent, which may have been too severe, is admitted. The Confederate flag was unfurled at Harrisonburg on the Fourth of July, and the portraits of LINCOLN and STONEWALL JACKSON were presented to the public gaze on that occasion. This is confessed by the *Valley Virginian*; but it says the display of the flag was disapproved by many, and the portraits in question, it is contended, were presented to the public eye on the private grounds of a gentleman as a matter of taste. So long as we now have but one National flag, none other is allowable on the celebration of our National anniversary, and to display the Confederate flag upon that occasion, now that the war is over and that flag has surrendered, is an offensive act which no loyal American citizen can regard otherwise than as an insult. There is no doubt that the gentleman who displayed the portraits of two heroes of the rebellion along with that of WASHINGTON had a right to do so on his own premises, but the act is nevertheless subject to criticism on account of its bad taste and offensiveness on that occasion. If these portraits were displayed daily, then the case would be different; but to place

the portraits of two arch-rebels alongside that of the Father of his Country upon the anniversary of an event which gave life to a Republic which LINCOLN and JACKSON died in their power to destroy, involves alike an inconsistency and an exhibition of disloyalty which cannot be defended or excused. This our cotemporary must admit, and hence should not resent the allusion of "F." to it with so much apparent ill-feeling. It is the constant repetition of such needless and offensive acts as these that keep alive the bitterness of alienation and strife which prevent the two sections from being unified and fraternal in feeling, sentiment, and interest.

A PAGE OF ANCIENT HISTORY.  
 To the Editor of the National Republican:  
 Sir: I have just been reading "A History of the War of the Rebellion of 1861," written by ex-President Jefferson Davis, and published in Louisville, Ky., A. D. 1895. On page 450 Mr. Davis says: "In 1865 the late Union soldier, as he was then sarcastically called, came to be looked upon, as he really was, as the rebel and traitor of 1861. He was tainted by a body of mounted and armed men, who surrounded and escorted him into the town where he then resided and where his family still remain, and where in the court house he would have lost his life but for the intervention of friends. Shortly after this a committee of Democrats called upon him formally and gave him notice that unless he left his home and family and departed from the State they would not be responsible for his personal safety. He left and came to Washington, where he still remains."

Does that chapter of history show any respect for the guarantees of its constitution? If it had, neither a mob nor a committee could have driven Mr. SWANWICK from the State, when the constitution declares that no person shall be deprived of his immunities and privileges without process of law. But the constitution is not respected, and Mr. SWANWICK had to go. That fact is sufficient to show the hollowness of the guarantees worked in the organic law of the State. Good preaching and bad practice do not work well in convincing the public mind.

Then the *News and Courier* says: "The General Government cannot intervene to compel the State to keep its engagements." Our cotemporary has a poor memory for history, or it would not so soon have forgotten that in 1861 the State of South Carolina violated its engagements to the General Government, and that in 1865 the General Government had intervened with its power and had compelled the State to keep its engagements to the Union. We are greatly surprised that our cotemporary should cultivate such an abridgment of memory or such a profound ignorance of American history.

THE DISPLAY OF THE CONFEDERATE FLAG.  
 The Stanton *Valley Virginian* takes us to task slightly, and a correspondent somewhat severely, under the unpleasant heading of "Misrepresentation," because THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN a few days since published a correspondence over the signature of "F.," which criticized with some justice the displaying of the Confederate flag on the 4th instant at Harrisonburg, Va.

We will give the *Valley Virginian* the full benefit of its scold as a matter of simple justice, and for the further reason that it virtually admits the more important cause of complaint that prompted our correspondent to refer to the occurrence at all. It says:

We were in Harrisonburg on the occasion referred to, and heard of such a flag, and also heard but one sentiment in reference to it, and that was of severe condemnation. We did not ask and did not learn who raised it, and seemed to be a source of so much annoyance to a large number of the people who spoke of it and was regarded as so utterly inappropriate that it did not deserve serious notice. United States flags floated from every public place and almost every private residence, and there was nothing that transpired to indicate anything else than the patriotic sentiment of Fourth of July patriotism.

Reference to the portraits of "WASHINGTON, LINCOLN, and JACKSON," which were suspended before the audience, no one ever believed that the Union flag was the high moral character of those Christian men and soldiers. Whatever now may be thought of the policy of secession and no national flag, it is not the Union flag that is the subject of the present controversy. Their moral heroism was amply illustrated in their lives, and while they may have erred in judgment, as we now think they did, the Union flag is not the subject of the present controversy. Their moral heroism was amply illustrated in their lives, and while they may have erred in judgment, as we now think they did, the Union flag is not the subject of the present controversy.

Not satisfied with the connection of the assumed statement of "F.," the *Valley Virginian* assails his motives as follows:

We do not know, nor do we care to know, who penned the article signed "F." If he is a native of the State and a resident of the Valley, he gives evidence of being very ignorant, and an amount of prejudice to be accounted for by no rational methods. His distorted reason is incapable of dealing fairly with any political question, and renders him utterly unfit to take part in the discussion of the Union flag.

To misrepresent the incidents of the occasion of which he treats, and to assign the existence of a spirit which was entirely foreign to that which prevailed, is a serious reflection upon the motives which controlled in the authorship of the article, and reveals a prejudice incapable of doing the fair thing, let it be associated with what will.

We leave "F." to vindicate his motives in his own time and way, as we are only responsible for his statements, having given currency to them. It may not be amiss, however, in this connection, to say that the cause of the criticism of our correspondent, which may have been too severe, is admitted. The Confederate flag was unfurled at Harrisonburg on the Fourth of July, and the portraits of LINCOLN and STONEWALL JACKSON were presented to the public gaze on that occasion. This is confessed by the *Valley Virginian*; but it says the display of the flag was disapproved by many, and the portraits in question, it is contended, were presented to the public eye on the private grounds of a gentleman as a matter of taste. So long as we now have but one National flag, none other is allowable on the celebration of our National anniversary, and to display the Confederate flag upon that occasion, now that the war is over and that flag has surrendered, is an offensive act which no loyal American citizen can regard otherwise than as an insult. There is no doubt that the gentleman who displayed the portraits of two heroes of the rebellion along with that of WASHINGTON had a right to do so on his own premises, but the act is nevertheless subject to criticism on account of its bad taste and offensiveness on that occasion. If these portraits were displayed daily, then the case would be different; but to place

the portraits of two arch-rebels alongside that of the Father of his Country upon the anniversary of an event which gave life to a Republic which LINCOLN and JACKSON died in their power to destroy, involves alike an inconsistency and an exhibition of disloyalty which cannot be defended or excused. This our cotemporary must admit, and hence should not resent the allusion of "F." to it with so much apparent ill-feeling. It is the constant repetition of such needless and offensive acts as these that keep alive the bitterness of alienation and strife which prevent the two sections from being unified and fraternal in feeling, sentiment, and interest.

A PAGE OF ANCIENT HISTORY.  
 To the Editor of the National Republican:  
 Sir: I have just been reading "A History of the War of the Rebellion of 1861," written by ex-President Jefferson Davis, and published in Louisville, Ky., A. D. 1895. On page 450 Mr. Davis says: "In 1865 the late Union soldier, as he was then sarcastically called, came to be looked upon, as he really was, as the rebel and traitor of 1861. He was tainted by a body of mounted and armed men, who surrounded and escorted him into the town where he then resided and where his family still remain, and where in the court house he would have lost his life but for the intervention of friends. Shortly after this a committee of Democrats called upon him formally and gave him notice that unless he left his home and family and departed from the State they would not be responsible for his personal safety. He left and came to Washington, where he still remains."

Does that chapter of history show any respect for the guarantees of its constitution? If it had, neither a mob nor a committee could have driven Mr. SWANWICK from the State, when the constitution declares that no person shall be deprived of his immunities and privileges without process of law. But the constitution is not respected, and Mr. SWANWICK had to go. That fact is sufficient to show the hollowness of the guarantees worked in the organic law of the State. Good preaching and bad practice do not work well in convincing the public mind.

Then the *News and Courier* says: "The General Government cannot intervene to compel the State to keep its engagements." Our cotemporary has a poor memory for history, or it would not so soon have forgotten that in 1861 the State of South Carolina violated its engagements to the General Government, and that in 1865 the General Government had intervened with its power and had compelled the State to keep its engagements to the Union. We are greatly surprised that our cotemporary should cultivate such an abridgment of memory or such a profound ignorance of American history.

THE DISPLAY OF THE CONFEDERATE FLAG.  
 The Stanton *Valley Virginian* takes us to task slightly, and a correspondent somewhat severely, under the unpleasant heading of "Misrepresentation," because THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN a few days since published a correspondence over the signature of "F.," which criticized with some justice the displaying of the Confederate flag on the 4th instant at Harrisonburg, Va.

We will give the *Valley Virginian* the full benefit of its scold as a matter of simple justice, and for the further reason that it virtually admits the more important cause of complaint that prompted our correspondent to refer to the occurrence at all. It says:

We were in Harrisonburg on the occasion referred to, and heard of such a flag, and also heard but one sentiment in reference to it, and that was of severe condemnation. We did not ask and did not learn who raised it, and seemed to be a source of so much annoyance to a large number of the people who spoke of it and was regarded as so utterly inappropriate that it did not deserve serious notice. United States flags floated from every public place and almost every private residence, and there was nothing that transpired to indicate anything else than the patriotic sentiment of Fourth of July patriotism.

Reference to the portraits of "WASHINGTON, LINCOLN, and JACKSON," which were suspended before the audience, no one ever believed that the Union flag was the high moral character of those Christian men and soldiers. Whatever now may be thought of the policy of secession and no national flag, it is not the Union flag that is the subject of the present controversy. Their moral heroism was amply illustrated in their lives, and while they may have erred in judgment, as we now think they did, the Union flag is not the subject of the present controversy. Their moral heroism was amply illustrated in their lives, and while they may have erred in judgment, as we now think they did, the Union flag is not the subject of the present controversy.

Not satisfied with the connection of the assumed statement of "F.," the *Valley Virginian* assails his motives as follows:

We do not know, nor do we care to know, who penned the article signed "F." If he is a native of the State and a resident of the Valley, he gives evidence of being very ignorant, and an amount of prejudice to be accounted for by no rational methods. His distorted reason is incapable of dealing fairly with any political question, and renders him utterly unfit to take part in the discussion of the Union flag.

To misrepresent the incidents of the occasion of which he treats, and to assign the existence of a spirit which was entirely foreign to that which prevailed, is a serious reflection upon the motives which controlled in the authorship of the article, and reveals a prejudice incapable of doing the fair thing, let it be associated with what will.

We leave "F." to vindicate his motives in his own time and way, as we are only responsible for his statements, having given currency to them. It may not be amiss, however, in this connection, to say that the cause of the criticism of our correspondent, which may have been too severe, is admitted. The Confederate flag was unfurled at Harrisonburg on the Fourth of July, and the portraits of LINCOLN and STONEWALL JACKSON were presented to the public gaze on that occasion. This is confessed by the *Valley Virginian*; but it says the display of the flag was disapproved by many, and the portraits in question, it is contended, were presented to the public eye on the private grounds of a gentleman as a matter of taste. So long as we now have but one National flag, none other is allowable on the celebration of our National anniversary, and to display the Confederate flag upon that occasion, now that the war is over and that flag has surrendered, is an offensive act which no loyal American citizen can regard otherwise than as an insult. There is no doubt that the gentleman who displayed the portraits of two heroes of the rebellion along with that of WASHINGTON had a right to do so on his own premises, but the act is nevertheless subject to criticism on account of its bad taste and offensiveness on that occasion. If these portraits were displayed daily, then the case would be different; but to place

the portraits of two arch-rebels alongside that of the Father of his Country upon the anniversary of an event which gave life to a Republic which LINCOLN and JACKSON died in their power to destroy, involves alike an inconsistency and an exhibition of disloyalty which cannot be defended or excused. This our cotemporary must admit, and hence should not resent the allusion of "F." to it with so much apparent ill-feeling. It is the constant repetition of such needless and offensive acts as these that keep alive the bitterness of alienation and strife which prevent the two sections from being unified and fraternal in feeling, sentiment, and interest.

A PAGE OF ANCIENT HISTORY.  
 To the Editor of the National Republican:  
 Sir: I have just been reading "A History of the War of the Rebellion of 1861," written by ex-President Jefferson Davis, and published in Louisville, Ky., A. D. 1895. On page 450 Mr. Davis says: "In 1865 the late Union soldier, as he was then sarcastically called, came to be looked upon, as he really was, as the rebel and traitor of 1861. He was tainted by a body of mounted and armed men, who surrounded and escorted him into the town where he then resided and where his family still remain, and where in the court house he would have lost his life but for the intervention of friends. Shortly after this a committee of Democrats called upon him formally and gave him notice that unless he left his home and family and departed from the State they would not be responsible for his personal safety. He left and came to Washington, where he still remains."

Does that chapter of history show any respect for the guarantees of its constitution? If it had, neither a mob nor a committee could have driven Mr. SWANWICK from the State, when the constitution declares that no person shall be deprived of his immunities and privileges without process of law. But the constitution is not respected, and Mr. SWANWICK had to go. That fact is sufficient to show the hollowness of the guarantees worked in the organic law of the State. Good preaching and bad practice do not work well in convincing the public mind.

Then the *News and Courier* says: "The General Government cannot intervene to compel the State to keep its engagements." Our cotemporary has a poor memory for history, or it would not so soon have forgotten that in 1861 the State of South Carolina violated its engagements to the General Government, and that in 1865 the General Government had intervened with its power and had compelled the State to keep its engagements to the Union. We are greatly surprised that our cotemporary should cultivate such an abridgment of memory or such a profound ignorance of American history.

THE DISPLAY OF THE CONFEDERATE FLAG.  
 The Stanton *Valley Virginian* takes us to task slightly, and a correspondent somewhat severely, under the unpleasant heading of "Misrepresentation," because THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN a few days since published a correspondence over the signature of "F.," which criticized with some justice the displaying of the Confederate flag on the 4th instant at Harrisonburg, Va.

We will give the *Valley Virginian* the full benefit of its scold as a matter of simple justice, and for the further reason that it virtually admits the more important cause of complaint that prompted our correspondent to refer to the occurrence at all. It says:

We were in Harrisonburg on the occasion referred to, and heard of such a flag, and also heard but one sentiment in reference to it, and that was of severe condemnation. We did not ask and did not learn who raised it, and seemed to be a source of so much annoyance to a large number of the people who spoke of it and was regarded as so utterly inappropriate that it did not deserve serious notice. United States flags floated from every public place and almost every private residence, and there was nothing that transpired to indicate anything else than the patriotic sentiment of Fourth of July patriotism.

Reference to the portraits of "WASHINGTON, LINCOLN, and JACKSON," which were suspended before the audience, no one ever believed that the Union flag was the high moral character of those Christian men and soldiers. Whatever now may be thought of the policy of secession and no national flag, it is not the Union flag that is the subject of the present controversy. Their moral heroism was amply illustrated in their lives, and while they may have erred in judgment, as we now think they did, the Union flag is not the subject of the present controversy. Their moral heroism was amply illustrated in their lives, and while they may have erred in judgment, as we now think they did, the Union flag is not the subject of the present controversy.

Not satisfied with the connection of the assumed statement of "F.," the *Valley Virginian* assails his motives as follows:

We do not know, nor do we care to know, who penned the article signed "F." If he is a native of the State and a resident of the Valley, he gives evidence of being very ignorant, and an amount of prejudice to be accounted for by no rational methods. His distorted reason is incapable of dealing fairly with any political question, and renders him utterly unfit to take part in the discussion of the Union flag.

To misrepresent the incidents of the occasion of which he treats, and to assign the existence of a spirit which was entirely foreign to that which prevailed, is a serious reflection upon the motives which controlled in the authorship of the article, and reveals a prejudice incapable of doing the fair thing, let it be associated with what will.

We leave "F." to vindicate his motives in his own time and way, as we are only responsible for his statements, having given currency to them. It may not be amiss, however, in this connection, to say that the cause of the criticism of our correspondent, which may have been too severe, is admitted. The Confederate flag was unfurled at Harrisonburg on the Fourth of July, and the portraits of LINCOLN and STONEWALL JACKSON were presented to the public gaze on that occasion. This is confessed by the *Valley Virginian*; but it says the display of the flag was disapproved by many, and the portraits in question, it is contended, were presented to the public eye on the private grounds of a gentleman as a matter of taste. So long as we now have but one National flag, none other is allowable on the celebration of our National anniversary, and to display the Confederate flag upon that occasion, now that the war is over and that flag has surrendered, is an offensive act which no loyal American citizen can regard otherwise than as an insult. There is no doubt that the gentleman who displayed the portraits of two heroes of the rebellion along with that of WASHINGTON had a right to do so on his own premises, but the act is nevertheless subject to criticism on account of its bad taste and offensiveness on that occasion. If these portraits were displayed daily, then the case would be different; but to place

the portraits of two arch-rebels alongside that of the Father of his Country upon the anniversary of an event which gave life to a Republic which LINCOLN and JACKSON died in their power to destroy, involves alike an inconsistency and an exhibition of disloyalty which cannot be defended or excused. This our cotemporary must admit, and hence should not resent the allusion of "F." to it with so much apparent ill-feeling. It is the constant repetition of such needless and offensive acts as these that keep alive the bitterness of alienation and strife which prevent the two sections from being unified and fraternal in feeling, sentiment, and interest.

A PAGE OF ANCIENT HISTORY.  
 To the Editor of the National Republican:  
 Sir: I have just been reading "A History of the War of the Rebellion of 1861," written by ex-President Jefferson Davis, and published in Louisville, Ky., A. D. 1895. On page 450 Mr. Davis says: "In 1865 the late Union soldier, as he was then sarcastically called, came to be looked upon, as he really was, as the rebel and traitor of 1861. He was tainted by a body of mounted and armed men, who surrounded and escorted him into the town where he then resided and where his family still remain, and where in the court house he would have lost his life but for the intervention of friends. Shortly after this a committee of Democrats called upon him formally and gave him notice that unless he left his home and family and departed from the State they would not be responsible for his personal safety. He left and came to Washington, where he still remains."

Does that chapter of history show any respect for the guarantees of its constitution? If it had, neither a mob nor a committee could have driven Mr. SWANWICK from the State, when the constitution declares that no person shall be deprived of his immunities and privileges without process of law. But the constitution is not respected, and Mr. SWANWICK had to go. That fact is sufficient to show the hollowness of the guarantees worked in the organic law of the State. Good preaching and bad practice do not work well in convincing the public mind.

Then the *News and Courier* says: "The General Government cannot intervene to compel the State to keep its engagements." Our cotemporary has a poor memory for history, or it would not so soon have forgotten that in 1861 the State of South Carolina violated its engagements to the General Government, and that in 1865 the General Government had intervened with its power and had compelled the State to keep its engagements to the Union. We are greatly surprised that our cotemporary should cultivate such an abridgment of memory or such a profound ignorance of American history.

THE DISPLAY OF THE CONFEDERATE FLAG.  
 The Stanton *Valley Virginian* takes us to task slightly, and a correspondent somewhat severely, under the unpleasant heading of "Misrepresentation," because THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN a few days since published a correspondence over the signature of "F.," which criticized with some justice the displaying of the Confederate flag on the 4th instant at Harrisonburg, Va.

We will give the *Valley Virginian* the full benefit of its scold as a matter of simple justice, and for the further reason that it virtually admits the more important cause of complaint that prompted our correspondent to refer to the occurrence at all. It says:

We were in Harrisonburg on the occasion referred to, and heard of such a flag, and also heard but one sentiment in reference to it, and that was of severe condemnation. We did not ask and did not learn who raised it, and seemed to be a source of so much annoyance to a large number of the people who spoke of it and was regarded as so utterly inappropriate that it did not deserve serious notice. United States flags floated from every public place and almost every private residence, and there was nothing that transpired to indicate anything else than the patriotic sentiment of Fourth of July patriotism.

Reference to the portraits of "WASHINGTON, LINCOLN, and JACKSON," which were suspended before the audience, no one ever believed that the Union flag was the high moral character of those Christian men and soldiers. Whatever now may be thought of the policy of secession and no national flag, it is not the Union flag that is the subject of the present controversy. Their moral heroism was amply illustrated in their lives, and while they may have erred in judgment, as we now think they did, the Union flag is not the subject of the present controversy. Their moral heroism was amply illustrated in their lives, and while they may have erred in judgment, as we now think they did, the Union flag is not the subject of the present controversy.

Not satisfied with the connection of the assumed statement of "F.," the *Valley Virginian* assails his motives as follows:

We do not know, nor do we care to know, who penned the article signed "F." If he is a native of the State and a resident of the Valley, he gives evidence of being very ignorant, and an amount of prejudice to be accounted for by no rational methods. His distorted reason is incapable of dealing fairly with any political question, and renders him utterly unfit to take part in the discussion of the Union flag.

To misrepresent the incidents of the occasion of which he treats, and to assign the existence of a spirit which was entirely foreign to that which prevailed, is a serious reflection upon the motives which controlled in the authorship of the article, and reveals a prejudice incapable of doing the fair thing, let it be associated with what will.

We leave "F." to vindicate his motives in his own time and way, as we are only responsible for his statements, having given currency to them. It may not be amiss, however, in this connection, to say that the cause of the criticism of our correspondent, which may have been too severe, is admitted. The Confederate flag was unfurled at Harrisonburg on the Fourth of July, and the portraits of LINCOLN and STONEWALL JACKSON were presented to the public gaze on that occasion. This is confessed by the *Valley Virginian*; but it says the display of the flag was disapproved by many, and the portraits in question, it is contended, were presented to the public eye on the private grounds of a gentleman as a matter of taste. So long as we now have but one National flag, none other is allowable on the celebration of our National anniversary, and to display the Confederate flag upon that occasion, now that the war is over and that flag has surrendered, is an offensive act which no loyal American citizen can regard otherwise than as an insult. There is no doubt that the gentleman who displayed the portraits of two heroes of the rebellion along with that of WASHINGTON had a right to do so on his own premises, but the act is nevertheless subject to criticism on account of its bad taste and offensiveness on that occasion. If these portraits were displayed daily, then the case would be different; but to place

the portraits of two arch-rebels alongside that of the Father of his Country upon the anniversary of an event which gave life to a Republic which LINCOLN and JACKSON died in their power to destroy, involves alike an inconsistency and an exhibition of disloyalty which cannot be defended or excused. This our cotemporary must admit, and hence should not resent the allusion of "F." to it with so much apparent ill-feeling. It is the constant repetition of such needless and offensive acts as these that keep alive the bitterness of alienation and strife which prevent the two sections from being unified and fraternal in feeling, sentiment, and interest.

A PAGE OF ANCIENT HISTORY.  
 To the Editor of the National Republican:  
 Sir: I have just been reading "A History of the War of the Rebellion of 1861," written by ex-President Jefferson Davis, and published in Louisville, Ky., A. D. 1895. On page 450 Mr. Davis says: "In 1865 the late Union soldier, as he was then sarcastically called, came to be looked upon, as he really was, as the rebel and traitor of 1861. He was tainted by a body of mounted and armed men, who surrounded and escorted him into the town where he then resided and where his family still remain, and where in the court house he would have lost his life but for the intervention of friends. Shortly after this a committee of Democrats called upon him formally and gave him notice that unless he left his home and family and departed from the State they would not be responsible for his personal safety. He left and came to Washington, where he still remains."

Does that chapter of history show any respect for the guarantees of its constitution? If it had, neither a mob nor a committee could have driven Mr. SWANWICK from the State, when the constitution declares that no person shall be deprived of his immunities and privileges without process of law. But the constitution is not respected, and Mr. SWANWICK had to go. That fact is sufficient to show the hollowness of the guarantees worked in the organic law of the State. Good preaching and bad practice do not work well in convincing the public mind.

Then the *News and Courier* says: "The General Government cannot intervene to compel the State to keep its engagements." Our cotemporary has a poor memory for history, or it would not so soon have forgotten that in 1861 the State of South Carolina violated its engagements to the General Government, and that in 1865 the General Government had intervened with its power and had compelled the State to keep its engagements to the Union. We are greatly surprised that our cotemporary should cultivate such an abridgment of memory or such a profound ignorance of American history.

THE DISPLAY OF THE CONFEDERATE FLAG.  
 The Stanton *Valley Virginian* takes us to task slightly, and a correspondent somewhat severely, under the unpleasant heading of "Misrepresentation," because THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN a few days since published a correspondence over the signature of "F.," which criticized with some justice the displaying of the Confederate flag on the 4th instant at Harrisonburg, Va.